



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

culcated and more readily consented to when their mode of presentation is characterized by an attractive and entertaining style.

"The non-Catholic student of religion in search of information with regard to Catholic ethical teaching will find nothing better in English on the subject," so reads the cover advertisement. We do not accord to this statement our unqualified assent. There are Catholic writers in English whose views offer more salutary guidance than Dr. Hill's, especially on such topics as Socialism (pp. 260-280), Authority (pp. 370-387), and Woman Suffrage (pp. 388-397).

The author reopens, pp. 351-357, the Bouquillon-Holaind controversy on education. It is evident that he approached the subject in a prejudiced frame of mind. Speaking of the right to educate, he says (p. 351), "Bouquillon gives it to the State first, to the parents last." In his pamphlet, "Education," Murphy, Baltimore, 1892, Second Edition, p. 40, Dr. Bouquillon says, "I purposed to prove, and, I take it, have proved that education belongs to individuals isolated and collected, to the family, to the State, to the Church; to these four together, to none of them exclusively." The fair-minded reader in perusing Dr. Bouquillon's treatise, the adverse answers of his critics, and his rejoinder to critics, will find that in cerebral activity he was by far their superior. The fact that his theories excited some disapprobation means little, when we reflect that censure is the tax a man must pay for being eminent.

THOMAS J. BURKE.

Religions of the Past and Present. Edited by James A. Montgomery, S.T.D. J. B. Lippincott & Co.: Philadelphia and London, 1918. Pp. 425.

This work is the joint product of eleven professors of the Faculty of the Graduate School in the University of Pennsylvania, who in the winter of 1916-1917, gave a series of lectures, fourteen in number, on the history of religions. They were afterwards elaborated and expanded for publication under the title cited above, and are of considerable value for the large amount of scholarly information they contain. To be sure, the quality of excellence is not uniform, as might be expected in such a diversity of authorship, but the book, as a whole, is attrac-

tively written, and offers the attentive reader a comprehensive survey of most of the religions treated.

But while there is much in the book to praise, there are also things that are open to criticism. Thus not all would agree with Professor Speck, in the opening chapter on Primitive Religion, when he views the widespread Indian concept of the Great Spirit as an importation coming from the early missionaries. Nor is the view which he favors of the total absence of moral sanction in primitive religions easy to reconcile with the worldwide use of oaths and ordeals, even where retribution in the life to come may be but feebly expressed.

The second lecture, by Prof. W. Max Müller, on the Egyptian Religion, is one of the least satisfactory chapters in the series. Religion is more than mythology. This the learned professor seems to have overlooked. He is so wrapped up in his mythological speculations that he has no thought for anything else. He would have done well to study the method of presentation observed by Professor Morris Jastrow in his well balanced and lucid lectures on the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria and that on Mohammedanism, forming chapters three and nine respectively.

Dr. Montgomery's lecture on the Hebrew Religion not only fails in comprehensiveness, being almost wholly devoted to the discussion of the Jahwe concept in Old Testament times, but leaves a bad taste in the mouth by its rank radicalism. One may ask whether the doctor's Christian faith is secure, if it has to rest on the acceptance of the God of the Old Law as once a poor wandering deity of the desert, whom the passing Hebrew tribe found near Mount Sinai and adopted, and who, from a tribal god in competition with the realistic tutelary deities of other tribes and peoples, came after a long process of time—not till after the Exile—to be viewed by the Hebrews as the one, only God. It is to be feared that teaching of this stamp by professed exponents of Christianity may prove a contributing cause to the lamentable falling off in number of candidates for protestant pulpits.

Scarcely more satisfactory is the sketch of early Christianity given by Dr. William R. Newbold in lecture XIII, where the attempt is made to set forth organized Catholicism of the fourth century as a compound of elements in large measure not present to the mind of Jesus, so that the Christian Church in the making

was only in small part the work of Christ. A far better production is Dr. Arthur C. Howland's lecture on Medieval Christianity. a well written, broadminded presentation from a non-Catholic standpoint. He might have added a few more touches to improve his picture, for example, emphasizing the period as the golden age of ecclesiastical art, and saying something of the heroic spirit of devotion on the part of many in behalf of those in distress.

Of the three lectures given by Dr. Franklin Edgerton, the Religion of the Veda, Buddhism, Brahmanism and Hinduism, forming chapters V, VI, and VII, all of which give evidence of scholarship of a high order, that on Buddhism is not above criticism. In the first place nothing is said of the very large and important lay element in Buddhism, of which King Asoka was a shining example, and without which the smaller, though more characteristic monastic order could not have long endured. Again the professor nods when he says on page 154: "The statement is still found in some very recent authorities that the Buddha himself died from indigestion caused by a hearty meal of roast pork, offered him by a simple peasant (a 'son of a smith'), at whose hut the aged saint stopped one evening." It would be hard to frame a sentence on Buddha's demise abounding in more inaccuracies, and it would be interesting to know the recent authorities from whom Dr. Edgerton gleaned this remarkable statement. No Indianist deserving the name of an authority would fail to know that the single daily meal of every Buddhist monk had be taken before noon, and might not be a hearty one. That Buddha himself failed in this respect is nowhere recorded in Buddhist annals. Nor is it anywhere recorded in Buddhist annals. Nor is it anywhere recorded that the aged saint in his travels stopped one evening in the hut of a smith, or that the fatal meal was one of roast pork. The *Book of the Great Decrease*, the only authoritative source of the account of Buddha's last meal, states plainly that at the invitation of Chunda, the worker in metals, Buddha with a number of the brethren went early in the morning to partake of the meal, which consisted, not of roast pork, but of dried boar's flesh together with sweet rice and cakes. (Cf. *Sacred Books of the East*, XI, p. 71). Dr. Edgerton goes on to say of the roast pork: "But the fact is that the story is based on a misunderstanding of a Pali word. The Chinese version of the story proves that it was a meal

of mushrooms, not of pork, which, according to Buddhist tradition, caused the death of the Master." It may be that the Chinese version gives the true meaning, despite the fact that it was not made till some three hundred years or more after the appearance of the Pali original. But the comment of Buddha on the inability of anyone but himself to digest the dish seems to tell rather in favor of the translation given by Rhys Davids, which, as has been pointed out, is not roast pork, but dried boar's flesh.

In the closing sentences where he expresses his belief that "in the second, third and fourth centuries, A.D., if not earlier, some Buddhist legends wandered to the west and became incorporated in Christian literature," and where in proof he points to the apocryphal gospels and the lives of the saints, one may question the appositeness of singling out the Christian story of a Barlaam and Josaphat, which though based on a Buddhist legend, did not take form till about the middle of the seventh century, having been composed first in the Pahlavi tongue of the Sassanian empire somewhere on the eastern confines bordering on Buddhist lands. Nor is his way of describing the story altogether without flaw. He says: "The story of the life of the Buddha himself is found in unmistakable form as the story of St. Josaphat; which name is itself a corruption of the Sanskrit Bodhisattva, the title of the Buddha before he became buddha (enlightened)." There are two inaccuracies in this statement. First, the name Josaphat, far from being a derivative from Bodhisattva, is the well-known Septuagint equivalent of the Hebrew name Jehosaphat. In the Greek version of the legend, it came to be substituted for the earlier, unfamiliar name, Joasaph, which, as Kuhn has pointed out in his masterly dissertation, *Barlaam und Joasaph*, 1893, was a variant of Jodasaph, the true derivative form of Bodhisattva. This is, of course, a minor inaccuracy; but the lecturer is more at fault when he calls the story of Josaphat "the story of the life of the Buddha." It is rather the story of the conversion of the young prince Gotama from his life of luxury in the palace to the hermit of a Brahman ascetic. This chapter in the legendary life of Buddha, belonging to the pre-Buddhist period of his earthly career, and told as well of the still more ancient founder of Jainism, contains nothing that is distinctively Buddhist. With modifications appropriate to each religion, the story, enriched with Indian parables setting forth the

wisdom of the ascetic life, came in the seventh century to be adopted by Christians and Mohammedans alike, doubtless at first serving as an aid to meet the strong Zoroastrian prejudice against the practice of asceticism. Jodasaph, the prince converted to the Christian faith and living in peace of mind as a Christian hermit, has nothing in common, save the name, with the Bodhisattva prince becoming a Brahman ascetic only as a preparation for his enlightenment as the Buddha. It is farfetched to view the mistaken reception of Josaphat into the martyrology as the unwitting canonization of Buddha himself.

In his lecture on the Religion of the Teutons, Mr. Amandus Johnson has so much to say on Norse mythology that only three pages are devoted to other features characteristic of this interesting form of religion.

The lecture on Zoroastrianism, by Dr. Rowland G. Kent, is illuminating, but a certain amount of repetition might have been avoided by saying in the first part of the lecture all that was known of the religious career of Zoroaster.

Dr. Walter W. Hyde has a chapter on the Religion of Greece comprising no less than seventy pages, but so interesting that the reader does not begrudge the amplitude to which the original lecture has been expanded. When on page 245 he ventures the statement, "The idea that the gods cared for men was a late conception," he is not so near the truth as when on page 250 he says, "Sacrifices and prayers were intended not so much for expiation as for asking and acknowledging blessings received from the gods. When in sickness or danger, the Greek made his vows, and, on recovery or escape, he religiously paid them."

Dr. George D. Hadzits, notwithstanding his too great readiness to see in all higher Roman deities the developed forms of low animistic numina, has a finely written chapter on the Religion of the Romans. Many will find it the most readable chapter of all.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

The Apocalypse of St. John. By Rev. E. Sylvester Berry, Columbus, Ohio: John W. Winterich. Pp. 229.

No matter how rich a devotional literature any language may possess, there is, after all, nothing which can supersede the Written Word of God in its ability to edify the faithful. He